Community resources

Follow us on Twitter Check our Reddit Twitter this Digg this page Contact us on IRC

courage is contagious

Viewing cable 06GENEVA2030, INSIDE THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL \

If you are new to these pages, please read an introduction on the <u>structure of a cable</u> as well as how to <u>discuss them</u> with others. See also the <u>FAQs</u>

Understanding cables

Every cable message consists of three parts:

- The top box shows each cables unique reference number, when and by whom it originally was sent, and what its initial classification was.
- The middle box contains the header information that is associated with the cable. It includes information about the receiver(s) as well as a general subject.
- The bottom box presents the body of the cable. The opening can contain a more specific subject, references to other cables (browse by origin to find them) or additional comment. This is followed by the main contents of the cable: a summary, a collection of specific topics and a comment section.

To understand the justification used for the classification of each cable, please use this WikiSource article as reference.

Discussing cables

If you find meaningful or important information in a cable, please link directly to its unique reference number. Linking to a specific paragraph in the body of a cable is also possible by copying the appropriate link (to be found at theparagraph symbol). Please mark messages for social networking services like Twitter with the hash tags **#cablegate** and a hash containing the reference ID e.g. **#06GENEVA2030**.

Reference ID Created Released Classification Origin

06GENEVA2030 2006-08-23 05:21 2011-08-30 01:44 CONFIDENTIAL US Mission Geneva

Appears in these articles:

http://www.letemps.ch/swiss papers

```
VZCZCXRO8205
PP RUEHAG RUEHBC RUEHDBU RUEHDE RUEHKUK RUEHLH RUEHPW RUEHSR DE RUEHGV #2030/01 2350521
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
P 230521Z AUG 06
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0761
INFO RUEHXK/ARAB ISRAELI COLLECTIVE
RUCNMEM/EU MEMBER STATES COLLECTIVE
RUEHZJ/HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL COLLECTIVE
RUCNISL/ISLAMIC COLLECTIVE
RUEHWH/WHA DIPL POSTS COLLECTIVE
RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK 1570
2006-08-23 05:21:00 06GENEVA2030 US Mission Geneva CONFIDENTIAL 06GENEVA1954 06STATE130904 VZCZCXRO8205
PP RUEHAG RUEHBC RUEHDBU RUEHDE RUEHKUK RUEHLH RUEHPW RUEHSR\
DE RUEHGV #2030/01 2350521\
ZNY CCCCC ZZH\
P 230521Z AUG 06\
FM USMISSION GENEVA\
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0761\
INFO RUEHXK/ARAB ISRAELI COLLECTIVE\
RUCNMEM/EU MEMBER STATES COLLECTIVE\
RUEHZJ/HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL COLLECTIVE\
RUCNISL/ISLAMIC COLLECTIVE\
RUEHWH/WHA DIPL POSTS COLLECTIVE\
RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK 1570 C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 04 GENEVA 002030 \
SIPDIS \
SIPDIS \
IO/FO, IO/RSH, DRL/FO, DRL/MLA, L/HRR \
E.O. 12958: DECL: 08/18/2016 \
TAGS: PHUM UNHRC PREI
SUBJECT: INSIDE THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL \
REF: A. A. GENEVA 1954 B. STATE 130904 \
     ¶B. C. STATE 130145 D. GENEVA 1675 \
     ¶C. E. GENEVA 1673 \
GENEVA 00002030 001.2 OF 004 \
```

```
Classified By: PolCouns Velia M. De Pirro. Reason: E.O. 12958 1.4 (d) \
Introduction and Summary \
1. (C) The newly established Human Rights Council (HRC) \
within the space of two months held an inaugural session
(June 19-30) and two special sessions (July 5-6 and August \ 11) both focused on condemning Israel. As the U.S. \
Government debates whether or not to seek election to the \
Council next year, Mission Geneva hopes to share some \
insights and concerns that may aid the debate based on the \\HRC sessions to date. This message will address the \
HRC sessions to date. This message will address the \ opportunities and challenges we see in the new Council.
will also try to explain the internal dynamics of the \
regional groups from the Geneva perspective. The mixed \
results of the HRC's inaugural session and the decidedly \ one-sided results of the two special sessions point to two \
distinct tendencies within the Council: one to seize the \
opportunity to redress the shortcomings of the Commission of \
Human Rights; the other to exploit the numerical superiority \ of G-77 and/or Islamic countries to press an agenda that \
gives precedence to economic, cultural and social rights over \ political and civil rights or to single out Israel for \
condemnation. U.S. efforts to influence outcomes in both \
areas will on depend our ability to develop issue-by-issue \
partnerships across regional groups and our willingness to \
consider new approaches to issues on the human rights agenda. \
 End Summary.
What's Possible \
      (C) The HRC's first session came to a disappointing end \
after efforts to focus on establishing the organizational
foundations for the new body were overshadowed by demands \
from the Arab Group and countries of the Organization of the \
Islamic Conference (OIC) to single out Israel and make the \
situation in the occupied territories a permanent feature on \
the Council's agenda. Nonetheless, early agreement among a \
number of states on the importance of establishing solid \
foundations for the new body indicated that, among those who \ see the Council as an opportunity to further the promotion \
and protection of human rights, there are areas of \
commonality. Although the spoilers, e.g. Cuba and the \
Palestinian observer, sought to derail some of the efforts, \
the first session of the Council agreed to a program of work \
for the first year, the creation of two working groups to \ elaborate proposals for the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) \
and the Mandate Review, and the temporary extension of
mandates and mechanisms, including calling for a final \
meeting of the Sub-Commission on Human Rights. These issues \
will be discussed in consultations and informals during the \
next month, in preparation for the September 18-October 6 HRC \
session, providing various venues where the U.S. priorities \
may be advanced.
\P3. (C) While there is general agreement among Western Human \setminus
Rights Group (WHRG) members on the range of human rights \
issues in Geneva, key to our efforts will be establishing \
partnerships across regional groups on these issues. On
organizational issues, the GRULAC may prove to be a useful \ partner. Division with the Eastern, Asian and African Groups \ will allow us to work with individual delegations on common \
approaches. It will be, however, essential to give them \ adequate support and when necessary the political cover to \
strengthen their will to oppose stronger members in their \
groups. \
Dealing with Country Situations \
\underline{\P}4. (C) A greater challenge lies in efforts to bring \setminus
attention to and take measures to deal with country specific \
situations. While Western Group countries and a few others \
support the Council's ability to address country situations, \ many see that as the root of the problems that beset the \
Commission on Human Rights. A number of states are motivated \
by self-interest in their opposition to dealing with country \
specific situations, fearing that they could become the \subject of scrutiny. Of these, a small group, including \
GENEVA 00002030 002.2 OF 004 \
Cuba, Burma, Iran and North Korea, are determined to \
eliminate any mechanism that allows the Council to focus on \
individual countries. The majority seem inclined to work \
through the Council to deal with systemic violations of human \rights through dialogue and cooperation, meaning reaching \
```

agreements on receiving technical assistance from the Office \setminus of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, other UN agencies, or regional mechanisms in order to avoid becoming the \ subjects of such resolutions. In their view country specific \ resolutions, which condemn violations or practices in a given $\$ state, should be used as a last resort. The opposition to \ country resolutions is in itself an indication of the value \ of maintaining this tool as the "stick" in urging nations to \ engage constructively and to request and accept technical \ assistance to address systemic problems. \ Special Sessions \ $\underline{\ }$ 5. (C) The mechanism for holding special sessions, although \recently abused by the OIC and Arab Group, remains a valuable \ option for addressing serious or emerging situations, \ provided the next special session is called to deal with a valid situation not involving Israel. Convoking a special \
session on any country, whether it is Darfur/Sudan, Burma, or \
the deteriorating situation in Sri Lanka, will likely be \ opposed by the concerned state, its regional group and those \ who object to addressing country situations in general. If \ the situation to be addressed is viewed, however, as a \ legitimate emerging crisis and not as a retaliation for the \ two Israel-focused sessions, interested states should be able \ to garner the necessary 16 signatures (the required \ one-third) from HRC members to convoke a session. A \backslash determination would have to be made early on regarding what \backslash would be the desired outcome of such a session -- bring \ attention to the situation; seek the country's acceptance of \ technical cooperation or advice; or pass a resolution condemning the situation and the government's culpability or \ failure to remedy it. Obviously, the latter would be the \ most difficult to attain. Intermediate measures that \ highlight dialogue and cooperation may yield improvements on $\$ the ground while at the same time restoring the validity of $\$ the special sessions mechanism. \ Regional Group Dynamics in Geneva \ (C) Last spring, in anticipation of the establishment of \ ¶6. the HRC and its first session, a great deal of discussion \ centered on the need to foster cross regional consultations \ and coordination with the goal of reducing the \ contentiousness that impeded the work of the Commission. \ Numerous meetings were held, including by Mission Geneva, $\$ with counterparts in various groups. Although welcomed by $\$ all, these efforts did little to overcome long-standing \
suspicions regarding Western countries' motives, particularly \ from the African Group, which insisted that its only leverage \ came from acting as a bloc. Interestingly, in the three HRC \backslash sessions to date we have seen less than the usual level of \backslash concerted action by the regional groups. Instead, we have $\$ seen the OIC, with Arab group support, take a dogmatic, \ no-holds-barred approach to pushing its one-issue agenda, \ including refusing to consult other delegations or to \ consider amendments to its resolutions. The regional groups' \setminus reactions to the OIC's tactics (as outlined in paras 7-12) provide some insights into their internal dynamics. important to bear in mind, however, that on certain \ fundamental issues, such as privileging economic rights over \ political rights, the unifying force is not the regional \ group but the level of economic development. 17. (C) OIC: Led in Geneva by Pakistani Permanent \ Representative Masood Khan, the OIC is very aggressive in \
pursuit of its anti-Israel agenda. It blithely ignores the \
hypocrisy of opposing the consideration of country-specific \
situations while singling out Israel for condemnation. Khan \ tends to view both the human rights and humanitarian affairs \ arenas as stages for him to expound his views and harangue \
those who disagree. In fact, at the conclusion of the \
conference on the new emblem for the Red Cross and Red \
Crescents Societies in June and the two HRC special sessions \ he requested the floor only to take to task the delegations $\$ with views contrary to those of the OIC. Egypt is another $\$ leading player in OIC activities in Geneva, often taking \responsibility for drafting resolutions or decisions. \ GENEVA 00002030 003.2 OF 004 \ Egyptian PermRep Sameh Shoukry prefers to work behind the \ The Palestinian Observer is only active when Israel \ is the focus of discussion. More moderate OIC members -- \ Morocco, Tunisia, and Jordan --, have told us privately that \
on Israel-related issues the pressure from Syria, Egypt, \

Algeria, and Pakistan to maintain group unity is \
overwhelming. The OIC's rigid discipline multiplies its \
power because its membership crosses four regional groups -- \

```
Asian, African, Eastern and Western -- though Western Group \
member Turkey tends to keep a low profile.
¶8.
       (C) African Group: This group has been the most \
outspoken in support of regional group unity and preeminence \
in the HRC's work. On procedural and organizational matters,
it is able to maintain a united front, though some states \
such as Ghana, Zambia, and Nigeria, complain of the "big \ country to the north" (Egypt) bullying them. African Group
unity has frayed, however, in dealing with the anti-Israel resolutions at the Council's first session and the two \
special sessions. In each of the three votes, Cameroon and \
Nigeria abstained. Ghana abstained in two and Gabon in one.
In discussions with poloffs, delegates from these countries \ have expressed concern about the lack of consultations within \
the group, the focus on Israel to the exclusion of all else,
and their opposition to dealing with country specific \
situations. We suspect that there is also worry that Sudan \
could become the subject of a resolution or special session. \
\underline{\mbox{\bf 19.}} (C) Asian Group: Its members admit that it is nearly \impossible to coordinate or reach consensus within this \
group. Unbridgeable gaps between Japan's, South Korea's and \ occasionally the Philippines' views and those of China and \
others tend to divide this group into two unequal blocks.
Japan, also a member of the Western Group, routinely finds \
itself isolated in arguing for more moderate positions. It \
is, therefore, reluctant to take a leading role. South Korea \
and the Philippines eschew any leadership role, but will \quietly press their views. China and India are the \
heavyweights, often taking similar views in support of NAM or \
G-77 positions, particularly in supporting economic, cultural \ and social rights over political and civil rights. The OIC, \
often with China's support, holds great sway over this group \with Syria and Pakistan pushing the anti-Israel agenda. \
\P10. (C) Western Group (U.S.): This group is generally in \agreement on the ultimate goal, though it frequently finds \
itself unable to agree on how to get there. All members are \
sensitive to U.S views, but are extremely wary of being seen \
as U.S. puppets. The EU plays a large, if not always helpful \
role, within the WHRG. The EU's preference for arriving at \
"common" positions on all issues frequently weakens its \
ability to act forcefully. EU positions, as reflected in \
statements during informals or plenary sessions, are too \
often weak and unfocused, revealing the EU's inability to \
bridge significant differences among its members. The French \
took a particularly unhelpful position during the last \
took a particularly unhelpful position during the last \
special session, which was turned around after demarches in \
Paris by the United States, Germany, and UK (ref A). \
Finland, current EU president, is extremely cautious, almost \ to the point of paralysis, in its efforts to coordinate EU \ positions for the Council. A few very close EU colleagues \
have voiced their frustration with the Finnish presidency. \
Switzerland tends to see itself as the keeper of both \
humanitarian law and human rights law, a distinction it \
regularly blurs. During the past two months, it has become \
an increasingly unreliable partner in the WHRG. Swiss \
Foreign Minister Calmy-Rey sees Switzerland as a mediator of \
sorts even when it is apparent that there is nothing to \
mediate. EU colleagues complain that she is dismissive and \
contemptuous of their concerns. Canada, particularly since \
the Harper Government took office, has been a strong partner. \
 The major cause for concern is Canada's vocal support for \
eliminating all resolutions in the Council. Australia and \the UK remain the strongest U.S. partners. \
<u>¶</u>11.
        (C) Eastern Group: Deep divisions in the Eastern Group,
between EU members and EU hopefuls on one side and Russia and \
a handful of former republics on the other, handicap its \
ability to act as a bloc. EU members and EU hopefuls abide \
by EU positions, but routinely consult with the U.S. \
delegation to gauge our responses. The Polish Mission, in \
particular, stays in close touch with us. The Russian \ Federation jealously watches for initiatives that may make it \ vulnerable to Council scrutiny of its own human rights \
situation and exerts heavy pressure on former republics to \
GENEVA 00002030 004.2 OF 004 \
fall in with it. \
```

12. (C) Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC): \
Members have openly voiced their discontent with the \
elimination of the Commission and their concern that the \
Council will be no better and possibly worse than the \
Commission. With this in mind, they have taken a keen \
interest in development of the procedures and structures for \
the Council's work. Most have made thoughtful proposals \
regarding the new body's organization. Cuba, not \
surprisingly, continues to play the spoiler, looking to \

```
eliminate country mandates (at least the one focused on Cuba) \
and to blame the U.S. and EU for anything it opposes. It has
yet to make any proposals regarding the issues under debate. \
On issues related to Israel, with the exception of Guatemala, the GRULAC has supported OIC actions. Argentina, Brazil, \
Uruguay in addition to Cuba co-sponsored the request for the \
special session on Lebanon. Argentine and Brazilian \
counterparts told poloff that, while the Lebanon resolution \ was one-sided and singled out Israel, the scale of the \ destruction in Lebanon warranted such action. During the \
June session of the Council, Brazil, Argentina, Chile and \
Ecuador invoked Mercosur unity to support the resolution \putting Israel permanently on the Council's agenda. \Guatemala has stood out by it willingness to take a \rightarrow rightarrow on these issues. Its explanation of \
principled position on these issues. Its explanation of \
position (abstention) at the last special session forcefully \
called on Council members to be even handed in their approach \
and to avoid actions that could undermine the Council's
credibility. \
 \
Comment \
----- \
¶13.
        (C) This message is based on Mission Geneva's \
observation of the conduct of delegations here and on \
exchanges with a large number of our counterparts. Based on \
responses to refs B and C, it appears that Geneva-based \ missions have a certain liberty of action or their \ governments fail to recognize that the United States does \
```

take note of their actions in the Human Rights Council. \ Mission Geneva would welcome any insights that posts could \ provide on their host governments' views and expectations for \ the Council. We would especially welcome information on \ their plans for the Sept. 18 - Oct. 6 session of the Council. \ End Comment. \

TICHENOR \